

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3603 for the Mississippi Wireless Communication Commission (WCC)

From: David L. Litchlitter

Date: June 30, 2009

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Melinda Simmons

Contact Phone Number: 601-359-9535

Contact E-mail Address: Melinda.Simmons@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 3603 is hereby amended as follows:

1. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 9. Scope of Work is being modified to add the following:

9.2.8 Preparation of Site As-Built Drawings
9.2.9 Detailed Design Review for Towers
2. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 10. Site Selection and Assessment is being modified to add the following:

10.4 The Vendor must also reimburse the State for the title search and title insurance cost, which has averaged approximately \$6,000.
3. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 12. Site Work is being modified to add the following:

12.20 As-Built Drawings
12.20.1 The Vendor shall keep a record set of drawings on the job sites at all times and, as construction progresses, show the actual installed locations of all items to include access road, fencing, utility services, fences and gates, grounding systems, foundations, fuel systems, and tower location.

12.20.2 At the time of the final inspection for each site, the vendor shall deliver the “marked” set of drawings to the State.

4. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 14.4 Design Criteria is being modified to add the following:

14.4.9 For each guyed tower and self-support tower configuration, a detail design plan and review process will be undertaken that will encompass the development of a detailed design for each element of the tower. The vendor shall prepare and submit detailed design drawings and analyses to the State for review and approval (at the State’s discretion). The drawings, analyses, and documentation shall include the tower foundation(s), tower structure, waveguide ladder, climbing equipment, grounding and lightning protection, and lighting system.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Question 1: RFP 3603 states that “Site Due Diligence” includes leasing, zoning, permitting, FAA, NEPA, etc. The RFP appears to contradict itself in places with regard to “Site Due Diligence”. What due diligence should the winning bidder price into its bid?

Response: The State will provide everything for site due diligence, except for permitting. Vendor should only price permitting in his or her RFP response, and the State will assist the Vendor to expedite permitting.

Question 2: What is the legal entity name(s) that is obtaining the leasehold or other real property interest in the sites?

Response: The State will hold all leases. The State’s intent is to own all of the sites; however, should the State lease or lease purchase a tower, the State will assign the lease to the awarded Vendor.

Question 3: It states in the RFP that the average range for the ground rents is \$600- \$800. The difference in the price between \$600 and \$800 is significant enough to affect pricing. Can you supply a list of actual ground rents for each site leased?

Response: See Attachment A – Monthly Ground Lease Amounts.

Question 4: Have any of the bidders who attended the pre-bid conference worked, directly or indirectly, on this project? If so, which bidder(s) and in what capacity?

Response: Motorola is the prime contractor for the turnkey MSWIN project. Towers of Mississippi serves two roles: a subcontractor to Motorola in site acquisition and the build-to-suit lease Vendor for the Phase I and Phase II sites deemed

essential to coverage in the most vulnerable counties in the Gulf Opportunity Zone and along the primary evacuation routes.

Question 5: What is the latitude and longitude of each of the current search rings?

Response: See pages 2 and 3 of Attachment B – Site Ring Information.

Question 6: What is the latitude and longitude of each site leased to date?

Response: See pages 2 and 3 of Attachment B – Site Ring Information. No ground leases have been executed for sites in this RFP.

Question 7: What are the tower types and tower heights for current search rings and sites leased to date?

Response: See pages 2 and 3 of Attachment B – Site Ring Information.

Question 8: What are the access road lengths for all sites leased to date?

Response: All access roads in sites completed to date are less than one mile. No ground leases have been executed for sites in this RFP.

Question 9: What are the power run lengths for all sites leased to date?

Response: The power run lengths will be unknown until the Detailed Design Plan (DDP) is in place. The State is responsible for power within 50 feet of the compound and that will remain the same for the Vendor awarded this project.

Question 10: Is it acceptable for the power runs to be installed overhead?

Response: Power runs to the compound may be installed overhead but not inside the compound.

Question 11: How many of the existing sites have overhead power coming into the site and how many have underground power?

Response: There are no sites with underground power so far.

Question 12: Would the state accept overhead power coming into the site?

Response: See answer to Question 10.

Question 13: If the state prefers underground power, would it be acceptable to bring power in overhead and then go underground for a distance greater than the tower height into the site?

Response: Yes.

Question 14: Does the State consider the ice bridge part of the equipment install or part of the tower install?

Response: The ice bridge is part of the equipment installation.

Question 15: Does the State consider the waveguide ladder part of the equipment install or part of the tower install?

Response: The waveguide ladder is part of the tower installation.

Question 16: Will the CD's provided to the awarded vendor be a full set consisting of grading, drainage, erosion control, equipment details, etc...?

Response: Yes.

Question 17: Section 14.4.7 states that For all towers with "Maximum Antenna Height" less than 500 feet, a minimum of 25 feet above the "maximum antenna height" must be reserved for future loading of up to two typical cellular arrays in addition to the 100% growth reserved in the specification above. Bidders must add an additional 25 ft. to the height of the tower. For instance, the pricing for each tower type and height must assume an additional 25 ft. in height to accommodate two (2) cellular arrays. Therefore the price for a 350 ft. tower should in fact reflect the price for a 375 ft. tower, correct?

Response: Yes.

Question 18: Can a list of owner furnished materials be provided? Is Motorola supplying the shelter?

Response: So far, Motorola has provided all equipment other than the tower structure. The waveguide ladder is part of the tower.

Question 19: Who is responsible for offloading the shelter and setting it on the concrete pad?

Response: Motorola.

Question 20: RFP No. 3603 at Section VII: Technical Specifications, subsection 10.1 (page 46) states that the State and Motorola have selected all sites for MSWIN Phase 2 and have been in the process of site selection for MSWIN Phase 3, which encompass all 45 sites covered by the RFP. At the Vendor Conference, it was confirmed that Motorola had employed Towers of Mississippi to perform this site selection. Such inside knowledge about specific potential sites give Motorola and Towers of Mississippi a huge competitive advantage over other offerors which do not have this knowledge. This is contrary to the level playing field required under federal

and state law and the equal treatment of vendors promised by this RFP, for example at Section II, subsection 13 (page 8). Is the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services going to make available to all offerors the site specific information known to Motorola and to Towers of Mississippi?

Response: Please note that neither Mississippi law nor ITS procurement policy prohibits an incumbent vendor from submitting a proposal in response to an RFP unless the specific solicitation contains such prohibition. The State has developed and made available to all potential Vendors Attachment B – Site Ring Information and the information in Section VII, subsection 20.5 of the RFP in an effort to mitigate the potential for Vendor conflicts of interest and to ensure equal treatment of all Vendors in the evaluation of their proposals. There has been no site lock on any sites that are a part of this RFP.

Question 21: If the site specific information which has been gained by Motorola and Towers of Mississippi is not going to be made available, does ITS intend to disqualify Motorola and Towers of Mississippi on the basis of organization conflict of interest pursuant to federal law, codified in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (“FAR”), Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 1, Subpart 9.5, Under this regulation, a prohibited conflict of interest is defined to include “when the nature of the work on [one] contract creates an actual or potential conflict of interest on a future acquisition.” FAR 9.502 (c).

Response: The State has provided adequate information for any experienced tower construction Vendor to prepare a competitive RFP response for the services requested by this RFP. See also the answer to Question 20.

Question 22: Do either Motorola or Towers of Mississippi (or entities in which either has ownership interest or business relationship) have an ownership interest in, hold leases, or possess options with respect to any of the 45 proposed sites referenced in RFP section VII, subsection 10.1 (pages 46-47)? If so, doesn’t this create a conflict of interest under RFP Section VI, subsection 3 (page 31)?

Response: At the time of site construction, the State or the awarded Vendor will hold site leases.

Question 23: What policies and procedures will the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services implement to ensure that no one with a current or past business or personal relationship with any of the offerors or any of their principals will be involved in the evaluation or award decision process?

Response: ITS utilizes a consensus scoring methodology for proposal evaluation for all RFPs. The ITS project manager will serve as the evaluation facilitator for this process and will ensure scores are assigned objectively. The individual serving as ITS project manager has no current or past business or personal relationship with any Vendor. All items must be scored by comparing the

proposed offering against the specifications in the RFP. Any score other than “meets specifications” must be supported with documentation of the exact manner and degree in which the requirement is exceeded or is not met by the proposal.

Question 24: Can the number of towers increase or decrease from the 45 set forth in the RFP after the contract is signed?

Response: Yes, the final number of towers could increase or decrease. The number, height, and loading of towers will not be determined until the DDP deliverable from Motorola is accepted by the State.

This RFP is primarily to build the sites that Motorola proposed as colocation sites. Any additional sites required to meet the RFP No. 3429 coverage requirement will be Motorola’s responsibility. Some sites may be deleted by combining dispatch locations, etc. in the final design.

If the answer to the preceding question is “yes”, will the successful Vendor be required to complete the additional sites? If yes, when will this be determined?

Yes, the state desires to use the award from this RFP for any required additional sites and any additional sites will be determined on a site-by-site basis at DDP acceptance.

Question 25: If the answers to Question 24 are both yes, what will the pricing for any additional towers be (i.e., Section IV, Number 24 provides that pricing is to be good for 90 days – so what will happen if the number of sites is increased after this 90-day period?)?

Response: The 90 days referred to in Section IV, Item 24 “Pricing Guarantee” is the default amount of time that the proposal pricing will remain valid (i.e. from the time of proposal opening to award). Once a contract is signed with the awarded vendor, pricing will be guaranteed for the life of the agreement.

Question 26: What are the 2 sites that are missing from Phase 3 (i.e., the RFP states that there are 47 sites in Phase 3 but this RFP is only for 45)? Or are these 45 split between Phase 2 and 3?

Response: The 45 sites are split between Phases 2 and 3.

Question 27: Why was this RFP reduced to 45 sites from the 57 in the prior RFP?

Response: The 12 sites in phase 2A needed to connect the capital area to Phase 1 are currently under construction and were removed from this RFP. The State has accelerated deployment on all MSWIN sites and is more than a year ahead of the original schedule. It is and has been the intent to have

contiguous coverage from Jackson to the coast for the 2009 hurricane season. The sites in question were necessary to accomplish this coverage.

Question 28: If the RFP was reduced to 45 sites because the other 12 needed to be online earlier for hurricane season, can you please explain how that is the case since the first group of sites under this RFP is scheduled for completion in January 2010, well before the next hurricane season, and therefore if the schedule as set forth in the RFP is still valid?

Response: These 12 towers will be ready to complete the coverage in the primary evacuation corridor during the 2009 hurricane season. All of Phase 2 (A, B, C, and D) tower construction is anticipated to be completed by January 2010 with the plan to be loaded and ready for acceptance by March 2010. See also the answer to Question 27.

Question 29: Are there site candidate rings for each site? If yes, please provide this information.

Response: Yes, see Attachment B – Site Ring Information.

Question 30: Have precise coordinates of site locations been determined (i.e., within the rings), whether or not these are subject to change? If yes, please provide these coordinates.

Response: The latitude-longitude of the initial colocation sites are provided on pages 2 and 3 of Attachment B – Site Ring Information. Precise site locations will not be determined until the DDP is complete.

Question 31: Has Motorola or any other party performed any engineering that would help determine expected tower types and heights at the different sites, whether or not these types/heights may change in the future? If yes, please provide this information. If the information requested is available, does it (tower heights and types) correspond to the Table on page 68 on which each Vendor will be evaluated?

Response: The initial colocation tower heights are attached on pages 2 and 3 of Attachment B. Actual sites and heights will not be available until DDP.

The referenced evaluation table was developed to include a mix of guyed and self-support towers and is generally based on colocation tower heights. The state intends to build guyed towers where feasible.

Question 32: Number 11.1 of Section VII provides that “The Vendor shall accept the State’s transfer of an option to purchase or lease sites and complete the acquisition with the property owner on non-state owned sites.” How many sites are there that are the subject of an option to purchase as opposed to a lease?

Response: There have been no options to purchase land at this point. The State anticipates owning all of these sites and leasing the land. The State will attempt to use state or publicly owned real estate if possible and available within the search ring.

Question 33: If options have been obtained for some or all of the sites, please provide the precise rent or purchase price for each so far obtained, and what expenses the tenant/purchaser will be responsible for (e.g., taxes, closing costs, etc.) under each agreement.

Response: Tentative lease prices are provided in Attachment A – Monthly Ground Lease Amounts. The State intends to own all sites if funding permits. Final leases have not been executed. If the State determines to lease or lease purchase, the Vendor will be responsible for reimbursement of due diligence as stated in Section VII, Item 10.3 of the RFP, plus the cost of title search and title insurance.

Question 34: If option does not exist with respect to a particular site at present, will the winning Vendor have an opportunity to negotiate, or participate in the negotiation of, the lease/purchase option that occurs after the contract is signed with the Vendor?

Response: No, Vendor will be handed site lock package containing same.

Question 35: Do any prospective Vendors (i.e., of the companies that were at the Mandatory Vendor Conference) or their affiliates have any interest in the ground where the sites will be situated?

Response: See answer to Question 22.

Question 36: Will any prospective Vendors (i.e., of the companies that were at the Mandatory Vendor Conference) or their affiliates be the landlord of the successful Vendor upon tower completion?

Response: No.

Question 37: Would the ownership of, or leasehold interest in, the ground where a site will be located by a Vendor or any of its affiliates (resulting in a lease with or purchase from such Vendor or such affiliate) violate the conflict of interest rules in Section VI, Number 3 of the RFP?

Response: See answer to Question 22.

Question 38: Does the Project Manager have to be an employee of the Vendor, or can they be an employee of the subcontractor?

Response: **The Project Manager may be an employee of the Vendor or a subcontractor.**

Question 39: Does the Project Manager need to devote 100% of their time to this project?

Response: **The State expects the Project Manager to be onsite in the field approximately 40 hours a week, with his or her attention to be directed to the MSWIN build out.**

Question 40: Does the Project Manager have to be based in Mississippi?

Response: **No, but the Project Manager should be in-state for a minimum of 40 hours per week. See also the answer to Question 39.**

Question 41: Is the Project Manager required to have an office in Mississippi?

Response: **No, but a Mississippi office is preferred. See the onsite requirements in response to Question 39.**

Question 42: Will experience with an individual or company subcontractor while the Vendor was at a prior company meet the requirements for having worked with that subcontractor before?

Response: **Yes, if the Vendor/Project Manager directly controlled the subcontractor's efforts on a daily basis. This experience must be clearly explained. The Project Manager must have worked with the subcontractors in the same roles as proposed for this project.**

Question 43: Must the Vendor have worked with a subcontractor's subcontractors before?

Response: **Any subcontractors at any level not identified in contractor's proposal must be approved by the State prior to performing work and are subject to all of the requirements in the RFP.**

Question 44: Is it mandatory that all parties in the respondent's team have prior experience working as a team?

Response: **This is not mandatory but preferred. All parties must have verifiable experience in the roles for which they are proposed in this project.**

Question 45: Are subcontractors required to have an office in Mississippi?

Response: **No.**

Question 46: If team members for this proposal were formerly client and vendor, can they use each other for references?

Response: **Yes, but the relationship must be clearly explained and relevant to the proposed role.**

Question 47: Please clarify what is meant by “insufficient references” in Section VII, Number 20.4.

Response: Three third party references are required for the Vendor, Project Manager, and any other subcontractors proposed. These references must be able to validate the Vendor’s and subcontractor’s experience and verify that the proposed project team has performed work of similar scope and size to the requirements in the RFP.

Question 48: Can ITS decide to buy one or more sites and then continue to lease other sites, or is it an “all or nothing” proposition, where either all sites will be owned by ITS or all sites will be leased?

Response: This is not an "all or none" RFP. The State may lease or lease purchase some sites. With funding, the State intends to own all of the sites.

Question 49: When will ITS make the decision as to whether it will buy or lease the sites and when will this be communicated to the Vendor?

Response: The State will make the decision as soon as funding is available. After the DDP for each Phase has been accepted, the Vendor will be notified.

Question 50: Of the priorities discussed of importance to the ITS for evaluation of the Vendor, can ITS detail the numerical or percentage weighting given to each of the criteria?

Response: The details of the evaluation process and scoring methodology for each RFP are developed prior to the receipt of proposals, and the summary point allocation by category is posted on the ITS website prior to review of proposals. See the ITS website, www.its.ms.gov, ITS Procurement Handbook, Section 018-010 for the ITS policy on evaluation of proposals.

Question 51: Can you please describe the weighting of the scoring for the pricing component?

Response: The Vendor’s proposed prices for tower heights and types in the Section VIII: Cost Information Submission will be used to determine the cost points, using the ITS cost formula which is as follows:

Points awarded for cost = $(1 - ((B - A) / A)) * n$

Where:

A = Total lifecycle cost of lowest valid proposal

B = Total lifecycle cost of proposal being scored

n = number of points allocated to cost for this procurement

See also the answer to Question 50 regarding scoring weights.

Question 52: Can you please describe the weighting of the scoring for the experience component?

Response: The experience of the Vendor, Project Manager, and the subcontractors will be scored. The aggregate experience of the proposed project team will be used to satisfy the mandatory experience requirement. See also the answer to Question 50 regarding scoring weights.

Question 53: If you decline to provide the information requested above, could you please explain why this information is not being made available.

Response: It is not the policy of ITS to provide weighting of specifications and/or percentages for the scoring categories prior to receiving the responses to the RFP. While some governmental entities include this information in their proposal solicitations, ITS has not found the inclusion of weights or point allocation to be of benefit to the State. Each RFP issued by ITS contains a summary-level description of the criteria and process that will be used in the evaluation of submitted proposals to determine the winning proposal. See also the answer to Question 50.

Question 54: Please describe the scoring points assigned/available for responding to the “Compound Development” and “Other Optional Services” elements of the “Cost Information Submission”.

Response: The cost for compound development will be added to the cost of the towers. The state will assume that half of the sites of each type (guyed or self-supporting) require compounds for large shelters.

Question 55: Please describe any sequencing to the scoring that would cause ITS to exclude a proposed Vendor without scoring the remainder of their proposal (other than failure to agree to the “Mandatory” items)?

Response: As stated in the RFP, failure to meet at least 80% of technical and functional requirements or failure to provide references that can validate Vendor’s, Project Manager’s, and subcontractor’s experience in tower construction can cause a proposal to be disqualified. Vendors should be aware that each scoreable item in the proposal is scored on a 10 point scale, with a score of 9 (i.e. 90%) awarded for responses that meet specifications. Therefore, the 80% threshold will be calculated as follows: total non-cost points times 90% meets specification score times 80% threshold requirement.

Other reasons the State may cease to score a proposal include, but are not limited to:

- Failure to provide a proposal bond.
- Failure to agree to a performance or payment bond.

- **An RFP response that is incomplete or not in the format required by the RFP.**

Question 56: Can the payment bond be invoiced to the State?

Response: **Yes, if the bond is line-itemed in Section VIII: Cost Information Submission.**

Question 57: Is there any party that was at the Vendor Conference that, as a result of their prior involvement in ITS' activities, you are aware does or may have additional information relating to RFP 3603 that has not been released to the other Vendors in the RFP or as a result of these questions? If the answer to the prior question is "Yes", please provide that information.

Response: **See answers to Questions 20 and 21.**

Question 58: Regarding the installation of the two cellular arrays referenced in Section VII, Number 14.4.7, will these arrays be used by ITS or by third parties?

Response: **The use of the space will be determined solely by the State. The State may reserve additional capacity for future state projects or permit use by third parties.**

Question 59: Regarding the installation of the two cellular arrays referenced in Section VII, Number 14.4.7, is it ITS' desire that these arrays be included in the pricing for the "Initial Loading Plus 50%" or in the "Future Loading – 100% Growth"? In other words, if the 100% Growth does not occur, but either one or two of these arrays is installed, does ITS contemplate a rent increase at that time, or should the pricing for these arrays be built into the "base" rent?

Response: **As stated in the RFP, the State intends to own these towers if funding is available. Pricing should not include lease cost with array space included. It is not the intent of the State to utilize the 50% or 100% reserve to accommodate leasehold commercial tenants.**

Question 60: In Section VII, Number 14.10.4, which addresses the lighting control, can this specification be modified if the Vendor will continue to own the tower such that the lighting control will be mounted outside the shelter so that the owner (Vendor) can access it for purposes of quarterly light inspections?

Response: **Yes, if the site is NOT owned by the State.**

Question 61: In order to make the anticipated timetable, has ITS made prior arrangement for expediting applications with local authorities and/or utility providers?

Response: **The WCC will work with the awarded vendor to expedite permitting and utilities.**

Question 62: On pages 69 and 70 of the RFP are two cost charts, one is the “Monthly Lease Cost” and one is the Lease Purchase Cost Option.” Our understanding is that the first chart is to be completed with the costs if the Vendor is to own the sites for the full term (i.e., the five year lease with four 5-year renewals), and the second chart is to be completed with lease priced for the payments during the three year lease period which has the option to buy. Please confirm that this is correct.

Response: **This is correct.**

Question 63: If additional tenants are installed on the towers during the three year lease period, we assume that the pricing for the towers in that case will be the price quoted in the Vendor’s response plus an additional amount to be negotiated. Please confirm this is correct?

If the prior question is correct in its assumption, when will this negotiation occur?

Response: **The state anticipates that Vendors will propose a multiple of the sites’ current annual revenue as the purchase cost for this option.**

Negotiation will occur at the time of purchase. The multiple (e.g. 10 X Annual Revenue) should be included in this proposal.

Question 64: Is it correct that ITS does not require (or desire) a purchase option beyond the three year period?

Response: **The purchase option is not required beyond the first three years.**

Question 65: Is there a reason that the State is not using its tower build purchase mechanism in its existing contract with Motorola to complete this portion of the build also (in addition to the 12 towers that must be built prior to hurricane season that will be built under the existing Motorola contract), since the State is contemplating purchasing all of the towers with anticipated stimulus money from the Federal government?

Response: **The State is attempting to obtain the best possible pricing for purchase or leasing of the towers in order to make the best use of taxpayer dollars - state or federal. We believe the RFP process facilitates this effort.**

Question 66: Are there any disputes or litigation between any entity and ITS as it relates to the sites or the completion of the work contemplated in RFP 3603 that could affect a Vendor’s completion of the work?

Response: **Not at this time to the best of our knowledge.**

Question 67: When do you estimate that the Site Lock Milestone Document will be delivered for each site?

Response: This depends on due diligence and varies site to site. Vendor will be provided information as it becomes available during the due diligence process.

Question 68: What is the minimum amount of time that the Site Lock Milestone Document will be delivered to the Vendor prior to the time that a particular site is required to be completed/on air?

Response: 45 calendar days

RFP responses are due July 13, 2009, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Melinda Simmons at 601-359-9535 or via email at Melinda.Simmons@its.ms.gov.

cc: File 37977

Enclosures: Attachment A- Monthly Ground Lease Amounts
Attachment B - Search Ring Information

Attachment A – Monthly Ground Lease Amounts

Monthly Ground Leases as offered or discussed for balance of phase 2 and for phase 3

2A	\$400.00	3A	\$600.00
2B	500.00	3C	400.00
2C	500.00	3D	500.00
2D	550.00	3E	500.00
2E	500.00	3F	500.00
2F	500.00	3G	400.00
2G	400.00	3H	850.00
2H	400.00	3I	550.00
2I	500.00	3J	500.00
2J	500.00	3K	500.00
2K	500.00	3L	500.00
2L	400.00	3M	500.00
2M	800.00	3N	500.00
2N	400.00	3O	500.00
2O	500.00	3P	400.00
2P	500.00		
2Q	500.00		
2R	500.00		
2S	500.00		
2T	500.00		
2U	500.00		
2V	600.00		
2W	500.00		
2Y	500.00		

Attachment B – Site Ring Information



Attachment B – Site Ring Information

ID	Type	Height	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
20601	Guyed	460	N 31 53 8	W 89 22 8
20602	Guyed	475	N 31 57 55	W 88 58 9
20603	Guyed	480	N 32 2 10	W 88 37 55
20604	Guyed	400	N 32 12 10.5	W 88 36 39.1
20605	Guyed	600	N 32 8 19	W 89 5 36
20609	SS	300	N 32 18 48	W 88 50 46
20611	Guyed	480	N 32 26 36	W 88 24 54
20612	SS	495	N 32 26 41.5	W 89 7 32.2
20501	Guyed	400	N 33 6 54	W 89 2 32
20503	Guyed	600	N 33 20 41	W 88 32 47
20504	Guyed	620	N 33 21 14	W 89 9 0
20505	Guyed	600	N 33 25 25	W 89 24 13
20506	Guyed	492	N 33 38 34	W 89 29 59
20507	Guyed	502	N 33 32 32	W 88 23 38
20508	Guyed	600	N 33 45 6	W 88 52 40
20509	Guyed	210	N 33 48 7	W 89 5 50
20510	Guyed	407	N 34 1 31.4	W 89 21 0.2
20512	Guyed	500	N 34 3 30	W 88 15 34
30201	Guyed	259	N 32 58 47	W 90 11 4
30202	Guyed	361	N 33 2 20	W 89 40 2
30204	Guyed	340	N 33 14 29.8	W 89 48 6.6
30207	Guyed	600	N 33 22 34	W 90 32 32
30208	Guyed	420	N 33 25 59	W 89 57 43
30210	Guyed	340	N 33 34 33.2	W 89 46 33.7
30211	Guyed	470	N 33 45 6	W 89 51 12
30212	Guyed	430	N 33 50 52	W 89 40 41
30215	SS	145	N 33 31 35	W 90 12 26
30301	Guyed	400	N 33 59 15	W 90 2 52
30304	Guyed	380	N 34 5 13	W 89 36 13
30306	Guyed	600	N 34 17 28	W 89 42 21
30307	Guyed	479	N 34 24 5	W 89 24 20
30308	Guyed	495	N 34 27 56.4	W 89 57 0.3
30309	Guyed	250	N 34 33 45	W 89 56 9
30311	SS	495	N 34 43 36	W 90 9 43
30312	SS	771	N 34 51 44	W 89 52 42
30314	Guyed	390	N 34 44 34	W 89 26 30
30401	Guyed	300	N 34 5 39.5	W 88 52 28.2
30402	Guyed	361	N 34 16 24	W 89 9 7
30403	Guyed	597	N 34 15 46	W 88 32 24
30405	Guyed	400	N 34 24 36.8	W 88 18 8.7

Attachment B – Site Ring Information

30407	Guyed	403	N 34 32 48.7	W 88 13 29.4
30409	Guyed	500	N 34 40 0.3	W 88 45 5.2
30411	Guyed	403	N 34 56 28.7	W 89 18 59.7
30412	Guyed	409	N 34 50 24	W 89 3 45
30414	Guyed	600	N 34 55 30	W 88 24 3